

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, and entry of this paper, is respectfully requested. Moreover, the applicants have reviewed the Final Office Action of October 19, 2004, and submit that this paper is responsive to all points raised therein.

**I. Interview Summary**

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner, Arpad Fabian Kovacs, for the telephonic interview with the undersigned attorney on May 6, 2005. In the Interview, claim 19 was discussed, as was Weber (U.S. Patent No. 3,670,413). Agreement was not reached at that time.

**II. Status of the Claims**

Claims 9-26 are pending in the instant Patent Application. Claims 15 and 19 have been amended. Claims 23-26 are new, and have been added.

Claim 15 has also been amended for formalities, changing a “the” to “said”. Claim 19 has been further amended as per the discussion in the Interview and appears above. Independent claim 23 is of a scope similar to amended claim 19.

**III. Rejections Under 35 USC 102(b)**

Claims 9-22 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Weber (U.S. Patent No. 3,670,413).

Independent claims 9, 12, 16 and 19 include recitations directed to flexible members with two parts. One part, a first part, is for moving from an inward position, engaging a stub or

rotating member associated with a motor, to an outward position, to allow for the lawnmower blade to be removed from the stub or rotating member. The other part of the flexible member is at a different location than the first part, and is such that pressure placed on this second part allows the first part to move from the inward position to the outward position.

Claims 9, 12 and 16, recite the above-described structure as the respective ends or second portions, of the flexible members, and these ends or second portions are configured such that downward pressure thereon, causes the engaging portions or first portions, respectively, to move outward. This outward movement, for example, allows the receiver, and hence, the blades to be releasable from the stub, or other rotating member.

Claim 19, as stated previously, and as further amended, is directed to a lawnmower blade including a receiver with flexible members having oppositely disposed first and second ends. The flexible members include first portions at the first ends, that are configured for moving between outward and inward positions, and second portions at the second ends, that are configured such that pressure thereon moves the first portions to the outward positions. The first portions are discontinuous from the second portions.

Weber teaches spring clips 13 with ends that are moved outward to release the blade 12 from the hub 14. This outward movement of the ends of the spring clips 13 is in no way the downward movement of the ends or second portions, that results in the engaging portions or first portions, respectively, moving outward, allowing the blades to be releasable, as recited in claims 9, 12 and 16.

Additionally, in Weber, the portion of each spring clip 13, that disengages from the hub 14, is the same portion, that if moved manually, would be moved outward. In each spring clip

13, there is not any way, that the portion for disengaging from the hub, and the portion that is moved outward, are distinct portions.

This is in contrast to the subject matter recited in claims 9, 12, 16 and 19, where the engaging/disengaging portion of each flexible member is a different portion than the portions for receiving the pressure, to move the engaging/disengaging portions to the outward positions.

Based on the above, Weber does not show the structure recited in claims 9, 12, 16 and 19. Accordingly, claims 9, 12, 16 and 19, are not anticipated by Weber under 35 USC 102(b).

Moreover, since the flexible members of claims 9 and 12 operate in a completely different manner than the spring clips 13 of Weber, it is respectfully asserted that Weber can not render claims 9, 12, 16 and 19 obvious under 35 USC 103(a).

Since claims 9, 12, 16 and 19 are neither anticipated by Weber under 35 USC 102(b), nor obvious in view of Weber under 35 USC 103(a), claims 10 and 11, 13-15, 17 and 18, and 20-22, respectively dependent thereon, are also allowable over this cited art for the same reasons. These claims further distinguish the invention from this cited art.

#### IV. New Claims 23-26

New claims 23-26 have been added to round out the scope of the invention. It is respectfully asserted that these claims are allowable over the cited art.

#### V. Additional Remarks and Conclusion

Additionally, it is respectfully asserted that the arguments submitted above, are compliant with 37 CFR 1.111(c), as they clearly point out the novel structure in the claims, that is not disclosed in the cited art. As stated above, the claimed flexible members, with different portions

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No. 62318  
Express Mail Label No. EV 471184365 US

for engaging/disengaging a stub or other rotatable member and portions for receiving pressure placed thereon to move the former portions between inward and outward (engaging and disengaging) positions, have been asserted as structurally distinct over Weber (U.S. Patent No. 3,670,413), so as to be patentable over the cited art (art of record).

Finally, the correspondence address for the undersigned attorney should be changed to indicate the correspondence address as follows:

**POLSINELLI SHALTON WELTE SUELTHAUS PC**  
**Jerome R. Smith, Jr.**  
**700 West 47<sup>th</sup> Street**  
**Suite 1000**  
**Kansas City, MO 64112**

The above described Final Office Action and subsequent papers arrived at the office of the undersigned with numerous inaccuracies in the undersigned's address, including an incorrect law firm name and spelling therefor, "street" was not spelled completely, the city misspelled, and the zip code incorrect.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this paper, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Allowance of all pending claims, 9-26, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**POLSINELLI SHALTON WELTE SUELTHAUS PC**

Date: June 22, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Jerome R. Smith, Jr., Reg. No. 35,684  
700 West 47<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 1000  
Kansas City, MO 64112  
Tel: (816) 360-4119  
Fax: (816) 753-1536